ranks today than the Ohio senator, and I believe him to be the logical candidate for our party in 1904. Senator Hanna has had abuse and calumny heaped upon him not only by the democratic party, but also by members of his own party, and the strictures of the latter are uncalled for and inexcusable.

Mr. Hanna is an honest, conscientious Christian gentleman. He has stood by McKinley and the republican party through thick and thin, and he has indicated by his great skill as an organizer, and his adroitness as a leader, that he is without a peer in this great American republic. Senator Hanna has made many sacrifices in order to stand at the helm of his party, and he has on account of his position been traduced shamefully.

Only recently did the jealous-minded accuse him of selfish and dishonest motives in his attitude in the Delaware senatorial struggle, but I am here to state that Senator Hanna is an honest man, not only in business, but also in politics, and selfishness is not found in his composition. For these various reasons I believe he is good presidential timber, and should he be successful in both the nomination and election he would be a worthy successor to the present incumbent.

Many people smile when Mark Hanna is suggested as the possible republican nominee in 1904, but there is no real occasion for these smiles. The fact is that Mark Hanna is the best possible representative of the republican party as at present constituted. His ideas are entirely out of harmony with the ideal of the founders of the republican party and yet he has brought that party to his way of thinking. He has shattered traditional notions; he has forced many republican leaders into the background; and he is today the master of the republican party. This is not exaggeration; it is a statement of very apparent facts.

Why should the republicans hesitate to put forward the man most truly typical of modern republicanism?

Choosing a Location.

The Editor of THE COMMONER has received so many inquiries from young lawyers in regard to choosing a location, that he deems it worth while to discuss the matter editorially.

No one can advise another in regard to location without knowing all of the facts which enter into a man's decision of so important a question. There is no part of the country which has any great and permanent superiority over another part; every portion has its advantages and its disadvantages, and in making a choice a number of things should be considered. First, the matter of health cannot be overlooked. Some persons find it necessary to seek a mild climate while others find a cold climate preferable. Some are driven to the high altitudes, while some find lower levels more healthful.

The young lawyer must also decide whether he wants to practice in a large city or in a smaller town, and this is to a great extent a matter of taste. A young man, can, as a rule, start more quickly and more cheaply in a small place but, generally speaking, the maximum of professional income which it is possible to secure varies with the size of the city.

The law is a stepping stone to politics. That profession, in proportion to its numbers, furnishes more public officials than any other. Therefore, the political complexion of a state often enters into the young man's calculations, although it is not always safe to figure upon political conditions. Questions arise from time to time which cause political upheavals and these may interfere with the plans of a man who locates in a state for political reasons. It is much wiser for a young man to study public questions, form his opinion, stand by his convictions, and trust to the triumph of the principles to which he adheres.

Sometimes there are special reasons which determine a young man's choice; for instance, he may, because of business relations or kinship, find it to his advantage to locate in a particular place, or to take up some special department of law.

The above suggestions are made to show how difficult it is for one person to decide what another person ought to do.

Before locating in a new place the young lawyer should visit the place and make a thorough investigation for himself.

The rules which govern success at the bar, eliminating accidental circumstances which may hasten or retard a lawyer's progress, are the same everywhere:

First,—Honesty—honesty in dealing with the court and honesty in dealing with the client—this is to a man's advantage wherever he practices.

Second,—Industry—nothing will take the place of application, constant and untiring. A knowledge of the law does not come by intuition, it is the result of research, and this is true no matter where one locates.

Third,—Ability to so present a case, either to court or jury, as to separate the important points from the immaterial ones, and to illustrate the points in such a way as to make them clear, is of great value. Given two persons of equal honesty and industry, and the difference in ability will ordinarily measure the difference in success.

There is room everywhere for the lawyer who has high ideals, and lives up to them, and who is willing to develop character and wait for his reward.

A Liberty Tree.

General Harrison's sentence, "I can go and see Kruger" has passed into history. The public has been told that in the delirium incident to the General's last illness, he frequently referred to the war in South Africa.

The Philadelphia Press in an interesting article refers to General Harrison's ancestry, and one who examines this family tree understands, if he did not know before, why the Great Indiana statesman was so thoroughly devoted to the principle of liberty. The Press says:

General Harirson is one of the instances too rare in American life where the scion of an historic stock continued to make history and add new luster to a name long ago distinguished. His father was a member of congress from Ohio from 1853 to 1857. His grandfather was the ninth president of the United States. His great-grandfather, after whom he was named, was active and influential in revolutionary politics and a signer of the Declaration of Independence. For one hundred and fifty years before the revolution the Harrison family from father to son through five successive generations were prominent and influential in the colony of Virginia. Some of the biographies of Benjamin Harrison trace his descent from Thomas Harrison, one of Cromwell's major generals, who perished on the scaffold after the restoration for having signed the death warrant of Charles I. This is an error, for Benjamin Harrison's grandfather, preceded by five greats—Master John Harrison—was settled in Virginia when Thomas Harrison, the regicide, was still a peaceful subject of Charles I. It is not unlikely, however, that the first Virginia Harrison and Major General Harrison, of Marston Moor and Naseby, were kinsmen.

Though he came of a Virginia family, his character and temperament were more akin to the old Puritan and Anabaptist stock, who were uncomfortable to their friends and invincible to their foes and who did not hesitate to kill their king for the glory of God and the good of the commonwealth.

The Money Question.

A Kansas paper has inquired why the editor of THE COMMONER does not explain the failure of prices to fall, as predicted by the advocates of free silver. The readers of THE COMMONER are well enough acquainted with the money question to know that the quantitative theory is the basis of the science of money. Other things being equal, the value of the dollar depends upon the number of dollars—an increase in the volume of money increasing the prices, and a decrease in the volome of money decreasing prices. This is the foundation of all argument made in behalf of bimetallism. For twenty years the price level fell, and during that time the producers of wealth and the debtors throughout the world suffered an almost incalculable loss, while the owners of money and fixed investments enjoyed an enormous advantage. Silver was struck down by those who desired a dearer dollar, and bimetallists were called advocates of silver, because they favored the restoration of silver to its former place in the currency. If the advocates of dear money had attacked gold instead of silver, the same people who favored the restoration of silver would have favored the restoration of gold. On one side of the question stood those who wanted, as Mr. McKinley once expressed it, to make "money the master, and all things else the servant;" on the other side stood those who wanted a sufficient volume of money to maintain the level of prices, and the free and unlimited coinage of silver, as well as gold, at the present legal ratio was urged as a means to this end.

Since 1896 there has been an unexpected increase in the production of gold, and this increase, which the republicans neither promised nor desired, has brought, in part, the advantage which the restoration of bimetallism would have brought more completely.

In so far as business conditions have been improved by the increased production of gold, bimetallists have been vindicated. If any one will take the trouble to read the literature circulated by the gold standard advocates in 1896, he will find that the quantitative theory of money was denounced, and a rising dollar eulogized. Nobody eulogizes a dear dollar now, but the advocates of the gold standard are seek-